UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Democracy and Clean Politics - *Victor S. Yarros*

The Road to Peace in Asia - *Theodore D. Walser*

The Dream of Euripides Is Ours - - - - - - - - - *Gabriel Rombotis*

If We Are to Win the Peace - *David M. Bloch*

Western Unitarian Conference News

VOLUME CXXX NUMBER 5

Chicago, July, 1944

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

David M. Bloch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

C. A. Hawley: Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Atchison, Kansas.

Gabriel Rombotis: After graduating from Meadville Theological School, Doctor Rombotis took his Ph.D. degree in the Department of Comparative Religion, University of Chicago.

Harry Taylor: Minister of the Grace Community Congregational Church, Jennings Lodge, Oregon.

Theodore D. Walser: For twenty-five years a missionary in China; recently returned to this country on the *Gripsholm*.

Arthur L. Weatherly: Retired minister of All Souls' Unitarian Church, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Flora White: New England author and old friend of UNITY.

James M. Yard: Executive Director of the Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews.

Victor S. Yarros: Attorney.

Contents

EDITORIAL —
Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 67
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 69

ARTICLES —
Democracy and Clean Politics—VICTOR S. YARROS 70
The Road to Peace in Asia—THEODORE D. WALSER 72
The Dream of Euripides Is Ours—GABRIEL ROMBOTIS 75
If We Are to Win the Peace—DAVID M. BLOCH 76

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS —
Far Apart—LEE SPENCER 79
Illumined Vision—LAURA BANKS MCDOWELL 79
Prejudice—ROSE MADELINE HARRIS 79
Christ of the Andes—MANFRED A. CARTER 79
Heritage—SARAH MIZELLE MORGAN 79

THE STUDY TABLE —
India—FLORA WHITE 77
America's Duty to India—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 77
America in the Philippines—JAMES M. YARD 78
In the Doughty-Burton Tradition—C. A. HAWLEY 78
Disentanglement Is Not Enough—HARRY TAYLOR 79

WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE NEWS 80

THE FIELD —
Unitarian Conference 66

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Unitarian Conference

The Lake Geneva Unitarian Conference will be held from August 13 to 20, at Conference Point Camp, located on Lake Geneva, near the town of Williams Bay, Wisconsin.

Conference Highlights

Conference Sermon, Wednesday, August 16, 8 p. m., by Ralph E. Bailey, minister of the Milwaukee Unitarian Church.

Conference Lectures, Friday, August 18, 8 p. m., by Senator Harold Burton, Moderator, American Unitarian Association, "World Democracy"; and by Mr. Earl Dickerson, City of Chicago Alderman, Member Fair Employment Practices Committee, "Democracy on the Home Front."

Firelight Services every evening, conducted by Kenneth L. Patton, minister of the Madison Unitarian Church.

Interesting Courses

"A Modern Interpretation of the Bible." Leader: E. Burdette Backus, minister of All Souls' Unitarian Church, Indianapolis, Ind.

"Religion As a Philosophy of Life." Leader: Arthur Murphy, professor of philosophy, University of Illinois.

"Sources of Liberal Faith." Leader: Charles H. Lyttle, professor of church history, Meadville Theological School, Chicago.

"General Teaching Methods." Leader: Mrs. Matilda Moore, Director of Religious Education, Church of Our Father, Detroit.

"Seminar in Educational Methods." Leader: Ernest W. Kuebler, Director, Division of Education, American Unitarian Association, Boston.

"Understanding the Teen Age." Leader: Horton Colbert, minister of the Universalist Church, Rochester, Minnesota.

"Materials and Methods for Teaching Juniors." Leader: Mrs. Horton Colbert, Rochester, Minnesota.

"Seminar in Administration." Leader: Ernest W. Kuebler.

"Creative Activities." Leader: Mrs. Horton Colbert.

Theme Talks

"Religion—A Tool for Living," will be the theme of the American Unitarian Youth groups. R. Lester Mondale, minister of All Souls' Unitarian Church in Kansas City, Missouri, will be the speaker.

"Men of Liberty—Past and Present," will be discussed by various speakers, including leaders from minority groups in the world today.

A. U. Y. Work Shops

The Workshops afford an immediate opportunity to practice techniques of religious living.

"Program Building." Leader: Mrs. Martha H. Fletcher, Associate Director, American Unitarian Youth, Boston.

"Minority Groups." Leader: John G. Gill, minister of the Alton Unitarian Church.

"Creative Worship." Leader: Kenneth L. Patton.

"Living Newspaper, Radio, and Drama." Leader: Josiah Bartlett, minister of the Seattle Unitarian Church.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volumne CXXX JULY, 1944 No. 5

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I.

That people were moved on D-Day to go into the churches to pray, rather than into the public squares to dance and shout, was a significant thing. That church bells were rung as for a funeral and not for a holiday has tremendous meaning. That even reports of victorious landings on the French coast brought no "hurrah, boys" at all—no waving of flags, no playing of bands, no gathering in the streets—shows what people think of this war. At last it is beginning to be understood that this war, and all wars, are utter tragedy, for which no victory, however complete, can bring any compensation. Public attention is riveted today only on the terrific cost of this struggle, its incalculable losses and immeasurable agonies, with triumph bringing nothing in the end but dust and ashes. It is riveted also on peace—the conviction that peace cannot come a moment too soon. The only reason that this western invasion front is tolerated at all is that this is judged to be the only and the quickest way to get peace. So insistently has this been dinned into the ears of the people, by every device of argument and propaganda, that it never enters people's minds any more that there may be another and better and even quicker way of getting peace than this mad butchery of fighting it through. The Pope pointed out this better way in his great speech to the College of Cardinals on June 2nd last. He declared that the present method of "complete victory or complete destruction" can serve only to prolong the war—i.e., delay the peace—and therewith produce "economic, social, and spiritual consequences [which] threaten to become the scourge of the age to come." Pius called for counsels of "wisdom and moderation," and asked for "a durable peace" that "all the nations could bear." That the statesmen of the United Nations can see nothing but sheer brute force is a bankruptcy of statesmanship, and in the eyes of posterity will bring a condemnation upon Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin which can be mitigated by no blood-soaked victory of arms. Let Mr. Dewey, or any other opposition candidate in the presidential election, declare that he will stop this war at the earliest conceivable moment and bring the boys home—and he will sweep the country as by the tide of a Noah's flood!

II

The wonder of Gandhi increases as the Mahatma grows older. I am certain that, when he was released from confinement, it was thought by the British authorities that he was near to death. In the days immediately following his release, there came circumstantial reports of his excessive weakness, of his recurring lapses into conditions of semi-coma. But now the weeks have passed, and Gandhi is not only living, but is regaining strength and activity. Stubbornly refusing medical attention, he has relied upon massage, dieting, long periods of rest and prayer, as he has done before, and the result is recovery from what has seemed to be the very extremity of death. What we have here is the triumph of the spirit over the flesh. We westerners know little of this. We are willing to concede the close interrelationship of mind and body, but usually with emphasis upon the influence of the latter over the former. We recognize how important it is to have a sound body as the condition of a sound mind. But all through the annals of religious history, from the ancient miracles of healing to the modern ministrations of a physician like the late Dr. Richard C. Cabot who regarded prayer as important as medicine, there runs the testimony of what the spirit can do with the flesh. What wonder that men have believed it actually possible to raise the dead? It would seem as though Gandhi, in these last weeks, had come back from the dead. At any rate he lives again after being perilously close to death, and it is his own inner spirit which has revived the frail flesh of his aging body. The spirit, in other words, is all-powerful. And if thus with the fibres and tissues, nerves and arteries of the physical organism, why not also with the laws and customs, institutions and cultures, of the social organism? We have had a century and more of what is known as the materialistic interpretation of history. We have been taught that it is the outward physical conditions of climate, and food production, and distribution of wealth, which determine the character and destiny of man, and the life and death of civilizations. And this

is true, as it is true that conditions of the body affect the mind. But it is not wholly true, nor chiefly true. There remains man's own creative spirit—his intelligence, his vision, his will—which may seize upon this ailing world and fashion it "nearer to the heart's desire." It is the recognition of this spiritual potency of man's life which constitutes the essence of pacifism. The pacifist would give the spirit of man a chance to do what arms and weapons and machines can never do. Gandhi calls it "soul force." It is this that can save our world, as also our bodies, when all else must fail.

III

All right, all right! Protest as much as you want to about all these strikes. I think they are pretty rotten too. But why not protest as well against the employers of labor who are highjacking the government for enormous profits? Is it treason to lay down tools when every hour of production is needed to carry on the war? Then why is it not equally treason to grab extortionate gains when every dollar is similarly needed to carry on the war? The factory owners, the corporation magnates, the employers generally, are today rolling in wealth greater than ever known by kings and princes. I know of a man who was making $20,000 a year before Pearl Harbor and is now making a cool $1,000,000 a year in the same business. And he is grouching about income taxes and denouncing labor for striking for higher wages! The robbery of government, and of the great mass of citizens, which is going on in this country today is enough to paralyze the mind and sicken the stomach. The government, you say, ought to stop it. You are right! But the war must go on, the goods must be had, and incidentally there are not enough investigators to catch up with one per cent of the dishonesty, nor police enough to arrest or courts enough to punish one-half of one per cent of the offenders. So we all suffer, while men without an atom of character or a vestige of loyalty play the good old game of cheating the government. What we have today in this situation of capital and labor alike is a complete breakdown of morals. We have no such thing as standards any more. Honor has disappeared; sacrifice is unknown. It is grab and get, while the grabbing is easy and the getting is good. Everybody out to use any advantage for plunder—to feather one's own nest at the public expense! I do not wonder that the boys at the front are sore, and that they threaten to come home and "raise hell." Why not? They have been conscripted, and under penalties of disgrace and death are forced to give their all to the nation's cause. And while they are thus held rigorously to duty, these millions of men safely and comfortably at home extort from the nation's need extravagant wages and indecent profits. All this is a crime of the first order, with the men at the top the chief criminals of them all. When we get through with the Nazis and the crackpot seditionists, how I would like to see a few of these self-seeking money grabbers brought to justice. This might soothe a little of the agony that springs out of this war.

IV

Now that the war has settled down to the sustained struggle for mastery in Europe and the far Pacific, it is possible to gather our wits together a bit and realize what a panic we fell into during the early days following upon Pearl Harbor. Take the matter of bombing, for example—the darkening of our cities, the organization of fire wardens and civic patrols, the posting of observation towers, the air-raid drills, the emptying of our museums of paintings and other precious articles, the taking out of bombing insurance, the provision of shelters, etc., etc! Much of all this represented a fine instance of public spirit—real sacrifice and energetic service upon the part of great numbers of men and women. But at bottom, none the less, it was hysteria of the worst description. The argument, in so far as there was any sane argument, seemed to be that the English cities were in danger and did all these things by way of precaution and protection, and that therefore our cities were in danger and must do the same things. Even country towns way up in Maine and New Hampshire went through these same performances of air-raid warnings and drills and other safeguards. Nothing could have been more utterly silly. For never at any time was there the slightest possibility of Nazi bombers raiding our coastal cities. As a mere matter of mathematics it was inconceivable. Yet we acted as though we were liable to be blown to bits at any moment! Then there was the hysteria over registration. In the wake of Selective Service, it was suddenly ordered that all men up to sixty-five years of age should be enrolled for conscription in some form or other of military activity. The government had not the slightest idea what it was going to do with these millions of men. But registration centers were set up all over the country, innumerable cards were printed and distributed, and on a certain day we all had to go tottering to the booths and enroll our names. Not a thing was done with these older men—nothing has been heard of the registration since it was taken. But we went through it like so many nincompoops frightened at their own shadows. Then there was the scandal of Japanese evacuation on the West Coast. We have all of us, including the administration, lived to regret this cruel action. And also to be ashamed of it! For there never was any danger either of Japanese invasion from without or Japanese betrayal from within. Why do we do such things as these when war comes along? There are two reasons. First, war is itself, psychologically speaking, a collective mania. When war breaks upon us, we all go more or less mad. Secondly, actions of this kind, fomenting fear, are first-class means of fostering the war spirit. These are

calculated devices for driving people to support the war. It is all understandable enough, when you remember what war is!

V

Wherever the Nazis have gone, they have made enemies for themselves. Strange, this queer notion of theirs that the way to subdue a people is to beat them down by force and violence, and thus terrorize them! These barbarians apparently can conceive of no other weapons but arms, and no other way to dominance but sheer physical power. It has never entered their heads that there are methods of persuasion and good will for winning and holding people. And so, wherever the Nazis go, they shock people, and alienate them, and horrify them, and so turn them into hateful enemies. Just here is the weakness of the whole Hitler regime—that it has no security in the love of men's hearts, a fact as true in Germany as in the so-called occupied countries. Hence our own feeling that our armies have but to appear on the continent, for the Dutch and the Belgian and the French to arise *en masse* to support us against the Nazi invaders! But are we so sure that this is going to be the case? For we also have been using force and violence to attain our ends as against anybody and everybody who gets in our way to victory. As between friends and enemies in Europe we have made no distinction in our military attacks, but have engulfed all in the horrors of modern war. Thus, for years now we have been systematically starving European populations, refusing to feed even the children of the peoples whom we are promising to deliver from the foe. They must die, if necessary, as a condition of their own liberation! In the same way, we have bombed ruthlessly not only German but French, Belgian, and Dutch territory. Day and night, through long and dreadful weeks, Allied bombers have swept with ruin the fields and cities and homes of our friends as well as of our enemies. Now come the ominous reports that these helpless folk are fearing and even even hating us almost as much as the Nazis, and that the idea that these populations will rise to welcome us is all a myth. We are waging war and visiting terror, in other words, upon the very peoples that we would save—and the result is only what we might expect if we had any reason in these things. Shall we never learn that violence destroys sympathy, and that the ravages of war forever break the heart? Twenty-five hundred years have passed since Buddha, and we have not yet accepted his truth—"Never does hatred cease by hatred, hatred ceases only by love, this is always its nature."

VI

A reprint of the statement of Seven Principles of World Peace, signed by representatives of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish groups in this country on October 6th last, prompts me to comment afresh on this great document. The fact that this statement has the support of all these three great religions is itself a matter of enormous significance. The names attached are not only representative but weighty with character and influence. But the great thing is the Seven Principles, which are as follows:

1. *The moral law must govern the world*—"the moral law which comes from God."
2. *The rights of the individual must be assured*—"states as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights."
3. *The rights of oppressed, weak, or colonial peoples must be protected*—"progress toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern."
4. *The rights of minorities must be secured*—"equal opportunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality."
5. *International institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized*—"an enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions."
6. *International economic cooperation must be developed*—"collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens."
7. *A just social order within each state must be achieved*—"the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good."

These Seven Principles may be well taken to match the Six Pillars of Peace set up by the Federal Council of Churches. In both cases there are items I do not like—as, for example, the specification in the fifth of these Principles of "the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law." This opens wide the door to war, and should be withdrawn in favor of the Levinson principle of the outlawry of war. But on the whole this is an impressively sound document. It was the failure to lay down and live up to such principles after the last war which led straight to the disaster of this present war. A similar failure after this conflict now raging will lead not so much to a third world war as to a final collapse of civilization.

Jottings

The Bahai faith was a hundred years old last month. In the great tradition of this faith appears the sublime teaching of nonviolence. "I have taken away from you the law of murder," said Baha O'Llah. "It is better that you be killed than that you kill."

The three hundredth anniversary of the birth of William Penn comes this next October. This is an event not only of national but of world significance. The name of this immortal Quaker must appear on any list of the chief benefactors of mankind.

This year's Pulitzer Prize for an American biography "teaching patriotic and unselfish service to the people," was awarded to Mr. Carleton Maybee for his book, *The American Leonardo: the Life of Samuel F. B. Morse.*

Mr. Maybee is a conscientious objector, and his book was completed in a C. P. S. camp!

President Roosevelt's attempts to give an historic name to the present war seem singularly infelicitous. His first suggestion, the "War for Survival," never got anywhere. His latest suggestion, the "Tyrants' War," is dreadfully suggestive of Hitler, Mussolini, *and* Stalin, to say nothing of the Empire in India. The fact is these momentous events have a way of naming themselves. The "World War" it is, and the "World War" it will remain.

The prayers on D-Day were appropriate enough. But why not prayers on A-Day and B-Day and C-Day and X-Day? Paul speaks of "continuing instant in prayer." Why not? Prayer all the time, and for all men everywhere?

Why all this conspiracy that it was "a happy coincidence" that the Fifth War Loan Campaign came just a week after the invasion of Europe began? If anything was more carefully planned than this, I have not heard of it—and this fact is to the credit, rather than to the discredit, of those whose business it is to put over this war. But why not be frank about such things?

Representative Hamilton Fish has introduced a resolution into Congress providing for the burial of an Unknown Soldier of World War II in an identical tomb in Arlington Cemetery beside the Unknown Soldier of World War I. This opens up a rather grim prospect!

The War Department has started a recruitment campaign for the WACs. This campaign, says an announcement, "will be the first test of whether or not a different WAC uniform will help. A soft and jaunty overseas cap is to be issued with the new . . . . summer uniform." So this is what our patriotism comes down to—a piece of millinery! Or so at least we are apparently asked to believe.

In the midst of a war more than two years old, and on the eve of the greatest military campaign in this war, the Methodist ministers, at the great Kansas City Convention, carried by a majority of only one vote, a resolution to support the war. The exact figures were 170 to 169! Such pacifist sentiment, standing up to such a test, is a measure of the power of the pacifist movement in this country.

The religious situation in Russia is easy to understand, if one keeps a clear head. Yesterday, for purposes of his own, Stalin *persecuted* the church; today, for similar purposes, he is *using* the church. Today, as yesterday, the church is in captivity.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Democracy and Clean Politics

VICTOR S. YARROS

Democracy, we all agree, is passing through a dangerous and critical period. Hosts of men and women have lost faith in democratic principles, and other hosts, while giving those principles lip service, are in fact indifferent to them and their fate. What has happened to democratic institutions as we Americans, or the British, have known them for some centuries? Why have they lost their hold and their value? Why do so many writers sneer at democracy and the party system, which is manifestly a corollary of basic democratic doctrines?

To be sure many radicals and advanced liberals take the position that our democracy, like that of the British, is almost purely political, whereas the progress of science, technology, mass production, and industrial concentration imperatively demands economic democracy as well—greater equality of opportunity, more equity in wealth distribution, more actual competition, and less monopoly or near-monopoly.

There was a time, the argument continues, when men were willing to work, fight, and die for civil liberty, universal suffrage (at least for males), the legal right to organize minor parties, and the like, but today these and similar liberties are either taken for granted or else have been found wanting and insufficient, if not a snare and a mockery. Starving men, it has been said, are not fed by constitutional guaranties of free speech and free assembly. The exploited and oppressed wage-workers cannot grow enthusiastic over trial by jury, habeas corpus, due process of law. Man does not live by bread alone; there are no such creatures as the "purely economic man" of Adam Smith and David Ricardo, but without bread, man cannot live at all. And to us of the present era, "bread" means good wages, reasonable hours of work, permanent jobs and fair conditions of labor. Our paramount problem is that of security, of freedom from want, of the good, balanced, satisfactory life for all.

This reasoning is cogent. The criticisms leveled at our present economic system are sound and serious. However, it does not follow, by any manner of means, that cynical treatment of *political* democracy is fully justified. True, in the words of Prof. Charles A. Beard, our constitution had, and needs, an economic underpinning. True, the early underpinning, recognized even by conservatives like Daniel Webster, is now

woefully inadequate. But the economic issues of today can, and ought to be, discussed candidly, sincerely, and fairly, in the spirit of the democratic process. That is, all reform proposals, from the Beveridge Plan up to Collectivism, or Socialism advocated by American radicals of the Dreher or Max Lerner school, should be canvassed calmly, without prejudice, without rancor, without name-calling and the imputation of bad faith. It is not discussion to call men Red, un-American, subversive, simply because they believe that half-measures will not solve our major economic problems, will not remove the fear of great and prolonged depressions.

And this brings us to the subject hinted at in the title of this article. Democracy is literally imperilled by dirty and ignoble politics, by vulgar and violent abuse of one's political opponents, by partisan malice and partisan invective and vituperation.

Of course, politicians, stump orators, and campaign managers have no monopoly of shabby and sordid forms of electioneering strategy and tactics. Even in scientific debates heat is often more conspicuous than light, question-begging than strict logic, rhetoric than quiet analysis and honest consideration of points made for or against proposals. No so-called discussion sinks to lower depths than partisan discussion during a national or state election, when power and high offices are at stake. Who has not ridiculed and scoffed at our partisan platforms, their clichés and catch phrases, their sweeping and absurd claims or indictments? Who can take the "pointing with pride" and "pointing with alarm" with a straight face, unless he is angry, vindictive, irrational, and perverse?

What enlightened and self-respecting person can attend a partisan meeting in an election contest without despairing of the party system? The more reckless and irresponsible a speaker is in denouncing the administration in power, the wilder and noisier the applause of the groundlings. "Hit them again," shouts the mob. The president, the cabinet, the leaders of the majority, the president's advisers, all these are assailed, maligned, grossly misrepresented, and caricatured. They are denied credit for any achievement whatever, and their motives are impugned or questioned on every possible occasion. Where the facts are too eloquent and striking to allow of distortion, the opposition to the administration remains obstinately silent. To say a good word for it would give it aid and comfort in the next campaign. So, in our politics, the immoral and vicious doctrine has been adopted and adhered to that the business of the opposition is to oppose, oppose regardless of truth, decency, or common sense.

And there are columnists and commentators who have the audacity to tell us that this is part of the American Way! In other words, in politics, as in war, all is permissible, all is fair. The Golden Rule has no application to interparty controversies. Mendacity and perversion become virtues, or, at any rate, trivial offenses to be expected.

What, in the long run, is the effect of such politics on the nation that habitually and persistently practices them? How can sincere respect for democratic institutions—legislatures, duly elected executives, duly appointed administrators—survive decades, centuries of political immorality and fanatical, irresponsible partisanship? The answer is: *it cannot survive.* Political campaigns are supposed to be educational, but what percentage of the average campaign is in any true sense educational? How many stump speeches and printed utterances exemplify faithful adherence to truth?

The founding fathers solemnly warned the American republic against "factionalism." They deplored and hated the first fruits of partisanship. They hoped that in the new world the party system as known in Great Britain would be found unnecessary. Alas, this hope was soon smothered. Washington himself was not spared by bitter partisans. Jefferson fared far worse. Lincoln's political and factional opponents exhausted the vocabulary of insult and vituperation in dealing with his policies, his philosophy, his personality, and even his physical appearance. Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the close associates and colleagues of these eminent statesmen, severally, could not have been handled more brutally and more shamefully if they had been criminal conspirators.

If the believers in democracy would only pause and reflect upon the mischief and harm wrought by meanness and malice in politics, they could hardly fail to perceive and acknowledge the patent fact that the loss of faith in democracy is in part attributable to our unhappy and disgraceful way of playing the party game. A pre-election campaign surely need not suggest a bath of malodorous mud. We can have a lively and stimulating discussion of issues and candidates without descending to the level of knaves and scoundrels. If we trust the common man, as we say we do, then we can address his intelligence and his sound moral instincts, not his basest passions.

We are getting ready for a campaign. Why can we not clean up our politics and try to live up to our religious and ethical professions? Why can we not renounce humbug, and show that we actually *believe* in reason and good will? Why set a bad example to youth in and out of school? If we want discussion, why not resolve to carry on a campaign of earnest and sober discussion? And why can we not, after an election without fraud and chicanery, cooperate, deliberately and above board, in making democracy work? Why should we not emphasize our points of agreement instead of our differences, and adjourn disputes over issues decided at the ballot boxes by lawful majorities? Vicious politics may yet lead to civil disorder. Totalitarian governments have their theorists and philosophers, and these never refrain from pointing the finger of scorn at our political manners and methods under the two-party system, or the multiple-party system, and claim infinite superiority for the one-party system. The latter plainly implies the denial of freedom of speech, of press, and of discussion. But these freedoms are valuable if they are properly and reasonably used, in the interest of the general welfare. To abuse them flagrantly, as the bigoted and reckless partisans or the malicious and purblind editors are doing, is to act as saboteurs of democracy, as foes of human decency and elementary honesty.

Recently a Republican governor of a western state told a chamber of commerce that "the ruinous policy of the New Deal closed in 1943, 8,665 places of business in that state." There was no New Deal legislation in 1943. We were at war all through the year, and all legislation was war legislation. One wonders what these 8,665 places of business manufactured or sold during the years 1929-1943. Were they prosperous under the old deal? What caused the unprecedented

depression? Did the New Deal aggravate the depression or check it and reverse the downward trend?

A Republican editor in Tulsa, Oklahoma, recently told his readers in an editorial that Roosevelt "has wholly thrown aside all pretense of supporting the Constitution and has repudiated every major promise he has ever made to the people." Mr. Roosevelt has been elected chief executive three times. The people have elected him. Did *they* believe the charges now made by a rabid partisan against his policies and measures?

These typical utterances can be multiplied a millionfold. Their authors are poor democrats and poor patriots. They help to discredit democracy the world over. They do not think; they think they think. Their partisanship is of the kind against which Washington warned the nation in its infancy. Now that we are fighting for survival *as* a democracy, it should be possible to launch a crusade for the elevation and rationalization of our political manners and ways. Let us not imitate the mad Hitlers even in the matter of rhetoric.

Most of us agree that partisanship and politics must "stop at the water line." But this is not enough. In respect to so-called domestic issues, honor, truth, and integrity ought to preside over, and pervade, our discussions of differences. Mud-slinging and the bandying of wild and moronic charges bedevil and demoralize democratic processes and institutions. We must purge our politics or assume responsibility for the sinister reaction against democracy.

The Road to Peace in Asia

THEODORE D. WALSER

The generally-accepted pattern of the war, in the thinking of the average American, is the eventual triumph by a military victory of the United Nations over the Axis Powers. The sequence is something like this: first Germany, then Japan, will collapse; "unconditional surrender," whatever that means; disarmament of the vanquished; policing by the victors; re-education of the youth of the defeated "aggressor" nations; rehabilitation and reconstruction of the agricultural, industrial, and social milieu everywhere—finally, peace and a return to the status quo ante. Many of the details of this picture seem completely unrealistic to me, but let us take this pattern of thinking as a kind of springboard, from which to dive into the sea of facts and factors that will influence, for weal or for woe, reconstruction in Asia.

As suggestive of the spiritual bases for a real peace —bases without which the whole superstructure will collapse—let me quote briefly from *Looking Toward the Post-War World:*

> An effective will to peace and understanding of the eternal truth which alone can create enduring peace stem from experience of the love of God who has shared His nature with His created human family. . . . Through Jesus, the Christ of history, we learn what God is like and what He would have men become. . . . Since all men are potential temples of the Divine, all are sacred. . . . We believe that the "beloved community" can be established only on a basis of voluntary cooperation, never on a basis of coercion. . . .

However, the other roads to peace that we are to consider here in detail have to do with other than the spiritual bases for peace.

The basic principle that I should like to present—a principle stemming out of the above paragraph—is that the keystone in the main arch of reconstruction in Asia must be the winning of the friendship and voluntary cooperation of the Asiatic peoples. In no other way can a solid foundation for lasting peace be laid. Even if one looks at the situation merely from the standpoint of numbers alone, this would seem to be self-evident. The non-white peoples of Asia number approximately two-thirds of the human race. Whether one looks upon them as friendly neighbors, with whom one desires to cooperate for peaceful change, or as potential enemies, with whom war must be avoided, it would seem that friendship with these colored races everywhere would be "the best policy." Whether from the viewpoint of ethics, religion, and altruism or from the viewpoint of self-preservation alone, it would seem to be a truism that the West, in what Spengler called "a decline," must make friends with the non-white Asiatics, obviously on the rise. After the war, it will be possible neither to coerce by force and violence the Asiatic nations, if they are hostile to us, nor to exploit them for our own national purposes, if they are friendly to us, presuming that one or the other of these might be attempted. All Asia is by this time thoroughly suspicious of us, for example our "allies," China and India, and our "enemy," Japan. As has been written so aptly by Herbert Agar, ". . . . in Asia a great many people . . . . decided that democracy was part of the defensive vocabulary of the English-speaking peoples, who are notorious for being unable to steal a chicken without pretending that they are doing it for the public good." All this must be changed. *Now* is the time to make friends. *Now* is the time to remove suspicions. *Now* is the time to remove non-whites everywhere from the threat of our yoke. After the war it will be too late. Our theme, then, is to explore ways and means toward making friends in Asia. We should correlate and announce *now* our post-war plans.

"Making friends in Asia" may sound easy, but there are many important phases of the problem that cannot even be mentioned here: famine and disease, housing, civil disorder, taxation, tariffs, colonies, problems existing between capital and labor, demobilization, banking, and transport.

Space permits but brief mention of certain other questions. For one thing, much has been said and written about re-education. That is indeed vital and, in such planning, machinery must be set up for re-educating war-minded nations—children, youth, yes, adults, too—everywhere and not merely in the totalitarian countries. The simple reason for this is that by the end of the war, the totalitarian pattern will have become universal. We will *all* have to be re-educated. As for trade, it seems axiomatic—but an axiom that might be easily forgotten in the flush of a possible victory—that the as yet undiscovered and undeveloped resources of both hemispheres should be made available to all people everywhere. Lastly, space forbids adequate mention of ways and means for relief, reconstruction, and rehabilitation other than to say that these must not be used as political weapons—a real danger—to control economic destinies and social institutions for selfish purposes. I saw enough—more than enough—of this

in "occupied" China, in 1937, 1939, and 1940 to know the power of these weapons, even "after the boys come home."

In more detail, let us now consider certain planks in the platform for "winning the peace" in Asia, after the war. Or, to change the metaphor, what are some of the signposts that point the way to reconstruction?

The primary condition for "a just and durable peace" is universal disarmament and the abolition of conscription. Of course, everyone and anyone will agree that, when the shooting war stops, there will be no more need for armaments for *military* purposes. There will be, however, less agreement, much less, as to the need for armaments for *policing* purposes. Therefore, at the outset it will be just as well to admit that the proposal for universal disarmament is the antithesis of the late Secretary Knox's proposal to "police the world." In fact, it would make such policing impossible. By the same token it is also the antithesis of the current British attitude, succinctly expressed by London's *The Nineteenth Century and After*:

> For Great Britain, it will be necessary to retain war as an instrument of policy and to be always prepared, upon just cause, to go to war. There is no other way of keeping the peace. . . . There is no such thing as friendship between nations. Nations never love one another, are usually indifferent to one another. . . .

The theories of these two spokesmen for the United Nations, if put into practice when the shooting war stops, mean just one thing: undeclared guerilla warfare, just as deadly and much less "honorable" than war itself. Finally, out of this would come World War III. Even the Atlantic Charter, written in August, 1941, by President Roosevelt and Premier Churchill, declared its belief that all nations "must come to the abandonment of the use of force."

What point in the march of time would be more effective and more influential psychologically for implementing this principle than "when the war ends"? What clearer proof could be offered the world of our good faith than universal disarmament and abolition of conscription *at once* after the sound of the firing ceases? One of Lord Acton's maxims was: "All power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." No imaginable scheme could be more loaded with dynamite than the plan, now being advanced by so many persons, that only a few, great, victorious nations remain armed and police the rest of the world. The temptation to misuse such power, or use it for military and national ends, would be irresistible. Competition and rivalry among the policing nations would begin. The policed nations —at first defeated, weakened, cowed by force—would gradually be driven in desperation to revolt. *The Moon Is Down* tells us all about this in story form. Over one hundred and fifty years ago the folly of such a policy was known. In "The Record of the Federal Convention of 1787," it is stated that Mr. James Madison said: ". . . . the use of force against a State would look more like the declaration of war than an infliction of punishment and would probably be considered by the party attacked as a dissolution of all previous compacts by which it might be bound." Today, too, victorious nations, retaining arms and using them to "punish" recalcitrant nations, would unquestionably run the risk of having the latter become so embittered that no "compact"—in this case, the terms of the peace agreement—would be honored. The coercion of states is impossible. Was the League of Nations able to coerce Japan when the Lord Lytton Commission made its Manchurian Report? No. Did the "freezing" of Japan's assets, July 26th, 1941, halt Japan? No, quite the contrary, for being in Japan at the time, I felt that the war began at that time and that after then anything might happen. And it did. Are the armies of Japan and Germany today able to secure the cooperation of subjugated peoples? No. Policing the world unilaterally is impossible. Instead, complete disarmament, mandatory upon victors as well as vanquished, is a sine qua non of peace.

Then, as a corollary to disarmament, there should follow an immediate plebiscite by which each nation—that is, each natural ethnic group—may determine its allegiance. Parenthetically, I believe that the word "immediate" is important in this plan. Current proposals for an interim, an armistice, a transitional period (the term used does not matter) would probably result in disagreement among the victors, for even now this disagreement is quite evident among the United Nations. During any interim, disagreement among them as to the division of the spoils, the allocation of colonies, distribution of mandates, air routes, etc., would develop into open dissension. A gradual development of power politics would be likely. Again the demon of imperialism would raise its head. And, meanwhile, bitterness among the defeated would increase. The day of voluntary assumption of responsibility for peace would be postponed. Without this voluntary cooperation, real peace is impossible. The immediate plebiscite is a natural sequitur to Mr. Sumner Wells' statement: "The age of imperialism is ended. The rights of a people to their freedom must be recognized." The most effective application of this principle would be freeing *all* peoples at once from control by any other nation, if they chose such freedom—theoretically at least, it is conceivable that some nation might choose, when offered self-determination, to remain in status quo. The Philippine Islands, after certain recent experiences, might choose to remain a part of the United States. A proof that the United Nations actually have renounced imperialism and that they really did fight for "freedom for all peoples" would be the immediate announcing of this plan. This would then be a "people's peace" and democratic processes would be released and fortified everywhere. Of course, we all think in these terms when we consider the plight of places like Korea, Manchuria, Formosa, etc. It is much harder to look favorably upon this principle if it means the liquidation of any of our own (United Nations) imperial interests. In fact, Premier Churchill has said, ". . . . we mean to hold our own," and has implied strongly that no part of Great Britain's far-flung empire is to be liquidated. This has greatly strengthened Japan's hands in her task of "pacification." After Pearl Harbor, in the Sumire Internment Prison in Tokyo, I heard Japan's broadcasts capitalizing upon this asset. Japan's task in China, India, Burma, and the East Indies has been made easier. With Europe subjugated under Germany, and vast areas of East Asia subjugated under Japan, it is becoming more and more apparent that "any kind of government is better than government by another." So this same international morality, if you please, which dictates that self-determination is the right of nations at present under Axis Powers must be applied to the securing of that same right for those nations formerly a part of the empires of the United Nations. For example, what is to be the fate of India, Hongkong, Shanghai, Singapore, the Philippine Islands, the East Indies, Indo-China? Are they to be retained,

if the United Nations win the war, as outposts of "white imperialism"?

The Asiatic nations are astir and restless. As an illustration, China's former pro-United Nations allegiance seems to be slightly qualified these days. The history of China's past association with "foreignism" has left a bad taste in the mouths of many Chinese. The Open Door Policy (1889), the Boxer War, etc., were infringements of that country's rights. The Nine-Power Treaty (1929) failed to preserve the sovereignty and territorial integrity of China. Extraterritoriality was clearly an insult. The recent abrogation of this was a step in the right direction, though actually nothing more than the recognition of a *fait accompli.* Edgar Snow probably made an overstatement when he wrote, "Even China takes a vicious pride in Japan's achievements," but aside from this there seems to be considerable reason for believing that many Asiatics are hoping that somehow some day a "war of freedom," as they call it, "from white imperialism" can be fought. One step toward forestalling such a horrendous race war would be to announce *now* that China is to have complete freedom and self-determination with regard to Hongkong, Shanghai, etc. As William W. Waymack said, in an address in Chicago, April 16, 1943:

> Nobody but the veriest dunce can fail to see that the Yellow peoples can and will organize, educate, adopt modern technology, and, in short, establish an equality in dynamics and fire-power as well as culture. It was only a brief day during which the Western world achieved and held the power to treat the Eastern world . . . as something inferior, to be dealt with on that basis. It has really been only a brief day, and, more importantly, it is done.

The same principle of self-determination should stand for India, the East Indies, the Philippine Islands, Indo-China, Burma, etc. The long-standing injustice, perpetuated when Western nations controlled Far Eastern peoples by force, can and must be eliminated once and for all by each ethnic group choosing freely the form of government under which its people desire to live. Of course, some group might consider itself as yet not able to govern itself. In such cases, their affairs should be administered as a common trust, not by any single nation or group of nations or by any regional bloc. An international authority should administer.

Therefore we come naturally, almost inevitably, to the realization that there must be an international world government—with *all* nations participating, with *all* having a voice in determining policies. The Delaware Conference (Delaware, Ohio, March 3-5, 1942) stated, as one of its findings: "A world of irresponsible, competing, and unrestrained national sovereignties, whether acting alone or in coalition, is a world of international anarchy," and "It must make place for a higher and more inclusive authority." That "higher and more inclusive authority" cannot be dependent upon any balance of power. The attempt to align a few, powerful nations "on our side," so that a check may be set up against the possible resurgence of inimical "aggressors" has proved to be a too easily disturbed mechanism for peace. The very weight of the coercing nations seems to be a dare to the coerced nations to try, with their puny strength, to tip the balance again in their own favor. Under such a plan, various forms of international immorality would thrive. Democracy would remain dead. The outbreak of a new war would come. Who checks the guardians? is a pertinent question. The answer is that the moral, non-coercive influence of an all-inclusive, international authority, representative of *all* the governed and prepared to bring about peaceful change, is the only check there can be. The word "aggressor" has appeared several times in the above. We never refer to ourselves, when we use that word, do we? It always means Germany or Japan, does it not? Well, without arguing that point, what about Japan, anyway? As we think of Japan and the future of Asia, we must review the past and ask what it was that brought war out of Japan. Nine out of every ten average Americans will answer at once "Japanese militarism." All right—for we will not pause to argue about the just distribution of shares of responsibility for the war—let us call it "Japanese militarism." Well, then, how can it be eliminated? By killing the militarists, as we seem now to desire to do? No, militarism will not be eliminated by killing our enemies, but by killing enmity. So—whence did Japan's enmity to us arise? Basically, there were two causes for Japan's enmity to us. One was racial discrimination. In 1919 the Japanese made an attempt at the Paris Peace Conference to provide that the peace treaty should adopt a declaration of racial equality, guaranteeing to each participating nation "equal and just treatment in every respect, making no distinction either in law or in fact, on account of their race or nationality." This proposal was blocked by England and the United States. At the time, it seemed a small thing to us here in the United States of America. Even today many Americans do not know this fact. Even though it was twenty-four years ago, I remember the reaction that took place in Tokyo, where I was at the time. To the Japanese it was a very grievous insult. It was never forgotten or forgiven. Again, in 1924, the Oriental Exclusion Clause of the new Immigration Law—which, literally interpreted, affected equally all Orientals—was really designed as a "slap" at the "Jap." They recognized it as such. Of course all Asia is involved in this question of racial discrimination, but the resentment at the time the law was passed was felt just where the designers of the law hoped that it would be felt most—in Japan.

Another cause of the attack upon Pearl Harbor was economic pressure. I am one of those who think that much nonsense has been said about the "have" and the "have not" nations. But to us who have always been "haves," the hunger of the millions of Asia is something we simply cannot understand. Japan was one of the hungry Asiatic nations before Pearl Harbor and the only one strong enough to make a bid for equality. Over-population, lack of raw materials, discriminatory anti-Japanese tariff barriers set up by surrounding nations, etc., were all forces leading to the attack on Pearl Harbor. Hence, if other future attacks upon other future "Pearl Harbors" are to be avoided, Japan's enmity must be removed by the removal of the food upon which it might feed—popular discontent with the economic barriers to happiness and resentment against racial discrimination. And what goes for Japan, goes for every nation in Asia. The Atlantic Charter states in Article V: "The fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing *for all* improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security." If applied to all nations in Asia, not only will the hands of peace-loving and progressive Japanese be strengthened, but peaceful change in all Asiatic nations will begin.

The above seem to be some of the signposts that would point us to our goal: permanent peace in Asia.

The Dream of Euripides Is Ours

GABRIEL ROMBOTIS

Liberty, as everybody knows, has been the master passion of the Greek people. The fighting Greece of today with its indomitable seamen, andarts, and evzones, does nothing else but relive the spirit of its history through the centuries. However, liberty without justice, universal justice, is impossible, as these bloody years of war are proving day by day. The sages of Greece were among the first to proclaim that realization of justice, that is, upright spirit and righteousness, is the only foundation upon which liberty and peace can securely rest. The poet Euripides, a modern man in an ancient time, unshakably believed in this truth and relentlessly fought for its triumph all his life. The more one is willing to understand his spirit, the more one's admiration and reverence for the man increase. What clearmindedness and social insight! Personally I have always looked upon him with deep humility.

When the time came to select a theme for a Master of Arts thesis, one of my professors, with whom I was on very friendly terms, suggested that I choose Aeschylus. "Why Aeschylus?", I inquired. "I cannot," he replied, "see a greater poet who speaks in the name of justice better than Aeschylus. Like Isaiah, he is one of the deepest spokesmen of the meaning of retribution and suffering." "What about Sophocles?", I suggested. "The harmony of his expression was nothing less than the replica of his own simple and magnificent life. He reconciled everything, transformed everything, symbolizing and personifying ideas. Harmony, piety, moderation, self-control, temperance, prudence, fortitude, justice, suffering as a means for the ennobling of man, such was his teaching. Was it not?" "Well," said my philosopher professor, "if you prefer Sophocles, it is all right with me." "Thank you," I replied, "but it is not all right with me. You know what admiration I have for both of them. Yet they cannot absorb my mind. One is the end of a glorious beginning of the Greek people; the other the very perfection of the splendid fruits of that superhuman miracle which created and perpetuated the spirit of Greece. Peace of mind, perfection! These two magnificent products of Sophocles' genius. They appeared, proved the possibility of such a realization; they lived, however, only for a moment, an unforgettable moment, to be sure, then life went on in the same old way. Perfection, peace of mind! Two ardent desires, always to be longed for. That sort of spirit I think I see only in Euripides. I would like to find out what that spirit means in terms of religion." "Euripides, my good old friend, Euripides!" exclaimed the professor. "That's all right with me, too. Then write on 'The Religion of Euripides'."

I did, but I wish I had followed the eminent classical scholar's suggestion, and developed my theme into a "regular-sized volume for the general public." How timely it would have been now! But, instead, I laid Euripides aside and pursued my studies. Years passed. Terrible social and political events, like avalanches in the prehistoric cataclysmic periods of Mother Earth, succeeded one another. Destruction still goes on. In the meanwhile, the great and venerable face of "smileless" Euripides, as Aristotle used to call him, came to my mind over and over again.

We have progressed, we moderns, in a thousand ways so different from those of "The Glorious City." Some of the claims of Euripides have been realized. Indeed, women vote, there is no *legal* slavery, the Olympians are not worshipped any longer, Delphi is silenced, Asklepios impotent, and Hephaestus is put to shame by the achievements of the modern worker. Twenty three hundred years have passed. We have advanced almost incredibly, no doubt. Nevertheless, Euripides' claims of justice and moral dignity still protest under new forms today with even more intensity and vigor. Like his, our time needs purging, cleansing, deeper understanding; we must realize the needs of the "common man" thoroughly, deliver him from his economic fetters, give more abundant education so that each individual may recognize in his heart that he truly is his brother's keeper, and not, like Cain, his murderer and exploiter.

I love to imagine Euripides wrestling with himself and the evils of the world around him. I love to think that millions today, like myself, are longing for a more spiritual outlook and understanding of life. I look upon these millions as my own brothers. I see them as one person whom I compare with the *youngest brother* of the prodigal son (created by the imagination of André Gide), who has no part in the paternal inheritance and wants none of it. He, like Euripides, prefers the voluntary exile to the self-satisfaction in the paternal routine. He goes away from his father's house seeking to succeed where the prodigal son failed. However, he admires the latter even in his failure, perhaps because of it; whereas he has little sympathy for the envious brother whose only concern had been selfishly to keep whatever came to him from his father without ever adding anything to it of himself. Now the youngest brother leaves the old house, promising to himself not to repeat any fatal mistakes. No, he will never come back to his steps, this youngest brother, but he will toil and toil until his dream for the common good of man becomes a reality all over the earth.

And everyone who has eyes can see this new fighter the world over, not like the other brother losing himself in drunkenness after he dared to leave the old house, but like Jacob in the night wrestling with God, working, struggling against injurious views and habits, sweating yet still keeping to his task, awaiting the glorious dawn to receive the blessing, not as Jacob had sought it for himself alone, but for all mankind, a mankind united at last in a true confraternity of nations.

And one can imagine the face of Euripides smiling with satisfaction, and hear his voice say: "You have at last understood the meaning of my thought, the sweetest dream of my life, that I had solemnly proclaimed long ago:

> Justice is on the earth,
> Is there, is by us, if men will but see it."

"The cause of education can not fail, unless all the laws which have hitherto governed the progress of society shall cease to operate, and Christianity shall prove to be a fable, and liberty a dream."

Henry Barnard.

If We Are to Win the Peace

DAVID M. BLOCH

Though the war raging almost five years is nearing its climax and the defeat of the Axis is assured, there is but little cause for rejoicing. Merely winning the war is not enough. It is the peace above all which must be won if there is to be a decent world order in the near future, and wars such as this one or even of greater magnitude are not to recur and destroy what still remains of our civilization.

In spite of the much heralded meeting between the chief Allied spokesmen, we are as yet a long way from the desired objective. While the plans formulated at Moscow and Teheran were of military importance, they do not, as far as is known, sufficiently cope with the serious problems confronting us.

We can no longer, as a matter of fact, depend solely on the politicians, or the so-called experts who are their advisers, to safeguard the peace. Regardless of how good are their intentions, or how pious their declarations, the peace will be muddled again, as in 1918, if the people as a whole remain indifferent to the moral implications of this global war. It was this apathy, no less, on the part of the American public which enabled the Legion and other ultra-conservative groups, after the last armistice, to go on with their insidious propaganda and activities, and injure the cause of peace. The war "to make the world safe for democracy" turned out to be a fiasco. It only made the world safe for Special Privilege to continue its plunder for another generation. One by one, the ideals for which so much blood had been spilt were sacrificed on the altar of a false patriotism, and the stage was set once more for the most costly and devastating war in all history.

The liberal, progressive elements, for some reason or other, are always inclined to overestimate their own strength while minimizing that of their opponents. One cannot therefore reiterate too often that it will be no easy task to vanquish the Powers of Darkness. For some mysterious reason nature somehow favors these forces a great deal more than those which represent "sweetness and light." Wilson's failure at Versailles, for example, is but a sad reminder of this unpleasant truth. His idealism unfortunately was not sufficiently rooted in reality to be effective. Had he been just a bit more realistic, more on his guard to begin with against the diabolic influences at work to disrupt his plans, he might have succeeded in preserving the peace. It was Wilson's overconfidence in the power of goodness to triumph over evil, more than anything else, which was the cause of his undoing.

The liberals who are interested in the regeneration of society would do well to remember all this when they attempt once again to storm the citadel of reaction, or to adopt plans for reshaping the world. Too many of them seem to pay but little attention to the problem of human greed and stupidity. Judging by their writing one would surmise that nearly all of our present-day ills came nilly-willy out of a clear sky; they are but the result of economic and material energies beyond our control.

Nor is there any cause for despair, these same oracles assure us. Due to our great discoveries in technology and science, we will soon be able to eradicate most of these evils and establish more or less of an ideal state.

Ludicrous as it may sound, that is precisely what the utterances of the great majority of these would-be liberators connote. Needless to say, the sooner we free ourselves of the influence of such banal and wishful thinking, the better.

Nor are the hard-headed realists or dogmatic materialists to be trusted. It is they, we must remember, who in the '20s and '30s, by their cynical outbursts against everything human and divine, helped to pave the way for the sinister forces to attempt their assault upon our way of life. And when the final assault came and the Nazi-Fascist barbarians were almost knocking at our gates, these gentry were far from penitent. Instead of opposing our common foe, some were actually courting the enemy; while the others were "splitting hairs" over Marx and Freud, and writing voluminous books on the coming revolution.

The few genuine idealists who did manage to raise their voices above the din of the market place, to warn us against the impending catastrophe, were of course laughed out of court.

Yet true idealism is precisely what this generation is unconsciously thirsting for. What we need is an all-embracing faith that will restore our confidence in spiritual values. Without such a faith no progress is really possible, since life is completely devoid of meaning. No longer can the liberals continue to mouth meaningless platitudes, pay lip service to a hypothetical democracy, and expect to get a hearing. If democracy is to be effective and once again become truly creative, it will have to free itself from its old established moorings. It must cease paying undue homage to a dead past or a nebulous future, and concern itself with the living realities of today.

We possess all the requisite material resources and scientific knowledge to turn this earth, if not into a paradise, at least into a decent place in which to live. What we so sadly lack is the right perspective, the spiritual insight to put those assets to proper use. It is the poets, seers, and philosophers—to whom life is a hazardous, yet glorious adventure—who are the true guardians of democracy. It is to them we shall have to turn for guidance if we are to lay the foundation of an enduring peace.

Before such a foundation can be erected it will be necessary, of course, to clear the ground of a lot of political and economic debris. Our body politic, for one thing, needs to be purged of the virus of expediency if any progress is to be made along the road to recovery. The self-centered domestic and foreign policy which makes a mockery of our most cherished ideals will have to give way to a policy of mutual understanding and cooperation. No barriers against other nations, such as high protective tariffs, stringent, restrictive emigration laws should be longer tolerated. These kinds of barriers finally lead to war. Nor can America and England for long remain at peace with the rest of the world if they do not abandon all political, or economic, imperialistic ventures. Not only India, China, and the South American republics, but all territories, regardless of their size, in any part of the globe occupied by a homogeneous, cultural group, will eventually have to be freed of foreign domination.

As for those countries which have been conquered

by the Axis or are otherwise under its control, it goes without saying that, when a complete Allied victory is finally achieved, they ought to be fully and promptly restored to the rightful owners with "no strings attached."

All this, to be sure, cannot very well be accomplished under a competitive economy such as ours. As long as the profit motive remains our main incentive we will naturally seek to exploit our own, as well as other, people. Only by introducing a new economy based principally on production for use can a civilized order be established and peace reign within and without our borders.

There are, no doubt, liberals who would shrink at such proposals. These timid souls simply revolt at the very idea of drastic, sudden changes in the status quo. They are still under the illusion that our sinking ship of state can be saved by instituting a few mild reforms.

It would be entirely a waste of time to try to convince these "parlor pinks" of their folly. Nor are the radicals, who see only in violent revolution a way out of our difficulties, to be taken seriously. The social problem, as a matter of fact, will not be solved either by compromising with the existing order or by resorting to extreme violent measures to bring about the necessary changes. There is no valid reason why, with the right leadership and the aid of science and religion, a sane balance cannot be struck.

Surely those of us who are on the side of the angels should have learned by now to profit by our past mistakes and not give the enemies of freedom another opportunity to enslave us. We can by no means afford to allow reaction to bungle the peace once more. There is too much at stake. Not only our fate, but the fate of future generations is literally in our hands. Let us make certain, therefore, that neither our children nor theirs shall have to face the horrors of another war.

Only an aroused public opinion, concerned about right and wrong, can compel the reactionary powers in control to loosen their grip so that the required changes can be made to prevent future conflagrations. This can only be achieved through a solid, united front. There must be no dissension in the liberal ranks, no indulging in idle intellectual speculation, or quarreling over minor ideological differences. The liberals must be able to coordinate their forces so as to be ready to fight obscurantism and reaction whenever or wherever they manage to raise their ugly heads. Our victory over the Fascists and warmongers will never materialize if religious bigotry, racial intolerance, and political and economic enslavement are allowed to function freely.

These are indeed times when our mettle is to be put to the acid test. It will require great daring and sacrifice on our part if anything worth while is to be achieved. The old order is dying, whether we will it or not. The historic pendulum is swinging with full momentum towards a changing cycle.

Shall we be equal to the enormous task ahead of us and mould the new world according to our heart's desire? For we are not, as the false prophets of our times would have it, helpless pawns at the hands of destiny. Much depends upon our choice. If we remain true to our rich spiritual heritage and act accordingly, we need have no anxiety over the "shape of things to come." After the stress and storm is over, a more advanced order based on intelligence and good will is bound to emerge.

Should we, however, fold our arms, resign ourselves to our fate, and simply let nature take its course, we are likely to return to a state of barbarism from which practically all traces of civilized life will have been obliterated.

The Study Table

India

THE PROBLEM OF INDIA. *By R. P. Dutt. New York: International Publisher Co., Inc. $2.00.*

To those who are vitally interested in the outcome of this World War, and in those factors that are most pertinent in producing that outcome, I know of scarcely a book more valuable than *The Problem of India,* written by the Editor of *The Labor Monthly* in London. He has that admirable trait, possessed by certain British authors of authority, of clear-eyed perceptivity in national affairs, with an accompanying passion for truth that compels them to recount events though the outcome may blast their country's reputation.

The book is very largely statistical. But there are a number of prominent chapters that are discursive and include the author's own deductions.

The authorities quoted are incontrovertible, and the deductions made from their affirmations perfectly justifiable. Nevertheless, there always remains the question of emphasis. If I remember rightly Clive is only mentioned once and then most casually. Also there is to me an almost inexcusable minimizing of the self-annihilation of Gandhi and his complete devotion to the welfare of others, the depressed, the wretched, the Untouchables.

In spite of this lack of emphasis where one would gladly see more, the author's portrayal of the living conditions of India's millions, at the time of her invasion by Britain, reveals their comparative comfort and well-being under the regime of the handcraft industries which then existed. The author makes vividly clear the fact that British rule in India had as its sole aim the financial benefit to England with no regard whatever for the needs of the native Indian citizen.

FLORA WHITE

America's Duty to India

INDIA WITHOUT FABLE. *By Kate L. Mitchell. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 296 pp. $2.50.*

Here is a book that should be read by every American. It is written as objectively as a book on India can be written by anyone who knows what the policy of Imperialism has done to industrially backward peoples.

We in America should read this book for many reasons. But a paramount reason is that American boys are fighting to recapture lands now held by the Japanese. A few quotations from Miss Mitchell's book will enlighten one as to why Americans are fighting in Burma. They may result in the reading of the book. The first quotation is from an editorial in an English

liberal weekly: "What Indians chiefly mean by 'independence' is that we should cease to play this traditional game of divide to rule." The second quotation is from the British-owned Calcutta *Statesman:* "It is folly so colossal as to be even too sublime, to suggest that a foreign government running the war on the cumbersome British methods without the active participation of the people, can check the infiltration of the Japanese."

The people of India are unarmed. Volunteer defense units are prohibited. Mrs. Mitchell says:

> British Colonial policy had always been based on the theory that colonies should be defended without the aid of the population as a whole. The battle of Malaya had been fought without the Malayans, the battle of Burma without the Burmese, and it appeared that the British Government intended to fight the battle of India without the Indians.

The following quotation is of the greatest interest to Americans in view of the fact that the people of India were refused permission to arm and defend themselves under their own leaders:

> The British rulers of India . . . were still confident that despite the disastrous experience of the Malay and Burma campaigns, they could defend India themselves with *American aid,* [italics mine] and that therefore political concessions to the Indian people were not a matter of immediate military necessity.
>
> It is unquestionably true that India cannot raise in a few months a modern military capable of fighting on anything like equal terms alongside of British and *American troops* [italics mine]. But it is equally true that the Indian people can be organized into a powerful auxiliary force.

And now that American troops are in India it is not strange that Congress President Ayad should appeal to the United States as well as Great Britain for freedom.

Chiang Kai-shek made a strong appeal to the British government. He said: "Without waiting for any demand on the part of the Indian people, as speedily as possible, give them real political power so that they will be in a position to develop further their spiritual and material strength." This was and is a challenge not only to Great Britain but also to the United States. War or no war, we in America cannot be true to our own ideals if we are indifferent to the struggles of other peoples for freedom.

> "They are slaves who fear to speak
> For the fallen and the weak."

But now that American soldiers are fighting in the jungles of Burma how can we hesitate to stand with the Chinese in asking for India's independence. Such a declaration on the part of the United States would be an affirmation to the people of India that we are not fighting to keep them in chains.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

America in the Philippines

MOTHER AMERICA. *By Carlos P. Romulo. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co. 234 pp. $2.50.*

The book begins: "This is a living story of democracy. It is political science personalized. America's work in the Philippines is a masterpiece in human relationship because it is *human.*"

It is a thrilling story for Americans to read. I hope it will have many readers.

One gets a good picture of the struggle for freedom under Spain and of how that struggle continued during the early days of American occupation. In such chapters as "What Imperialism Means to the Far East," "America in the Philippines," and the "White Man in the Orient" one sees clearly the significance of what the United States has done in the Philippines. It has been a remarkable experiment and it has proved that education and the treatment of colored men as human beings pays big dividends. The result is what happened in Bataan and Corregidor.

A few quotations will make my point clear:

> Of more lasting importance to us than any material advantage was the fact that the Americans seemed to like us and enjoyed living among us. This was first made apparent by the schoolteachers.
>
> Manila with Americans and Filipinos living together in perfect understanding became the gayest city in the world. It was host to two hemispheres—the most cosmopolitan city in the Orient. And it was the only city in the Orient, as the Philippines was the only country in the Orient, where every native was smiling and friendly.
>
> There were always Filipino guests at the American affairs. And no Filipino thought of giving a party without inviting some of his American friends.

If Americans in Manila can treat Filipinos in such a friendly fashion of full equality, why cannot they treat Filipinos and other colored people in America in the same way?

In my opinion Colonel Romulo has been more than fair to Americans. I cannot believe Americans were quite as wonderful as he says, but at any rate the lesson is plain—brotherhood pays.

The documents included in the appendix are the Magna Charta of the Philippines. They show the important steps in the evolution of the Filipino people to self-government. They add greatly to the value of the book.

JAMES M. YARD

In the Doughty-Burton Tradition

IN THE STEPS OF MOSES. *By Louis Golding. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society. 556 pp. $2.50.*

LIFE IS TOO SHORT. *By C. Kay-Scott. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 348 pp. $3.50.*

Here are two remarkable travel books, both of which received their inspiration from Doughty's great classic, *Arabia Deserta,* and from the travels and writings of Burton. In the introduction, Scott's son, Paul I. Wellman, says that his father according to many "should have been an Elizabethan," and that he is "always struck by the remarkable parallels between his life, and that of Sir Richard Francis Burton." Like Doughty, Kay-Scott has shown ability as a linguist, writing English, Latin, German, French and Portuguese. In addition to these languages he is familiar with Greek, Spanish, and three or four African dialects.

Kay-Scott's first love has always been Africa where he specialized in tropical diseases, becoming later head of that department in Tulane University. Changing his life, he became a rancher in Brazil where he specialized in Portuguese literature and mining. His South American adventures form the most interesting part of the book. The rest of the book deals with America, and includes several marital adventures, all of which ended in disaster. The real contribution of this book is the insight into Africa and South America.

Louis Golding's *In the Steps of Moses* makes no pretense to great erudition, but it is there. The Biblical and Talmudic background of Moses with a knowledge of Arabic, Hebrew, and other oriental languages gives a scholarly confidence to every page. With a foundation in archeological research, Golding traces the traditional Egyptian sources for the historical Moses. He then follows the course outlined in the Bible through the Peninsula of Sinai and Transjordania up to Mount

Nebo. His visit to Petra ought to be read along with Doughty's great description in his *Arabia Deserta.*

If these two books send their readers back to Doughty's great book, they will have accomplished their purpose. This book ought not to be forgotten, combining, as it does, sound scholarship with unforgettable adventure written in almost perfect prose.

C. A. HAWLEY

Disentanglement Is Not Enough

THE FALL OF CHRISTIANITY. *By G. J. Heering. New York: Fellowship Publications. $1.50.*

G. J. Heering is a Professor in the Seminary at the University of Leyden, and President of the International Union of Anti-Militarist Ministers and Clergymen. There is a Foreword by Dr. E. Stanley Jones, who heartily concurs in the author's thesis that the Christian Church has fallen from grace since the very early centuries when it failed to take a positive stand against war and the absolute authority of the state. This happened, of course, when Constantine made Christianity a state religion.

Professor Heering wrote his book in 1928 but its message today is as fresh as the morning. It insists that the moment has arrived for Christianity to cut adrift from imperialism and the state, and take its stand definitely against war. E. Stanley Jones puts the matter succinctly when he says in the Foreword: "Disentangle or decay—that is the sharp alternative. This book . . . . shows how deeply Christianity is committed to another way of life, incompatible with the way of war."

The author examines with great care all the portions of the New Testament that have any connection with war and violence, and one cannot read these opening chapters without realizing how full the New Testament is of contradictory statements and how easy it is for the protagonist of any particular point of view to find sanction in some text or other. It seems to the reviewer that we shall be on far firmer ground when we cease seeking for authority save that of human experience. Surely that is sufficient at this late date to confirm all world lovers that "force is no remedy."

But Christianity, if it is to survive, must do more than disentangle itself from the state and war: it must form itself into a World Society that renounces the whole system of living that has brought us to this dread hour. Professor Heering does not go far enough.

HARRY TAYLOR

Trumpets on New Horizons

EDITED BY LUCIA TRENT

Far Apart

The world shouts its demand, "Conform! Conform!"
In vain the soul protests, "Create! Create!"
And always will the two be far apart,
As far as love and hate.

LEE SPENCER

Illumined Vision

If all the gems of Samarkand
Were piled as high as mountains stand,
Their dazzle and glitter could never share
The vision of splendor painted in air
By roseate fingers of Redbud tree:
The luminous hope of a world to be!

LAURA BANKS MCDOWELL

Prejudice

Unlock that time-scarred brain,
Stop marching
To yesterday's tom-tom;
Listen!
The heart-beat of tomorrow
Cries,
"Climb out of the leprous caldron
Of hate!"

The blood-red smear
Of prejudice
Dangles before the vicious eye,
Festering between crusty lids,
That spread,
Growing to the size of a bull,
Horns and feet shoot through,
The monster lunges,
To spike his quarry,
Then, to kill.

ROSE MADELINE HARRIS

Christ of the Andes

A continent of beast and gilded cross,
Of races blended through the heated years,
Is weighted with a new world's gain or loss
And lighted by the flash of planes and spears;
The weeping and the laughing peasant heart
Is slaving for the rich man's foolish gold;
Three smaller lands are full of books and art,
I wait the story that will yet unfold.

Then let the little priest and master go,
With prudish cries for purer cult and race,
The mammoth Christ of all the Andes snow
Can see the new world and the new world face.
The weeping Christ of endless "Green Hell" plains
Can bring to birth these bursting labor pains.

MANFRED A. CARTER

Heritage

Like measured music through the peaceful hills,
The tolling of a church bell loud and clear
Awakens me as dawn approaching fills
The east with rays of gold. We hold no fear
Some self-made God will ever devastate
These quiet hills or make an open bier
Of homes or fertile fields we cultivate,
For Freedom's road was much too long and dear.

Soon bells will toll again in conquered lands
As here. Free men will kneel as heart demands
Before their chosen shrine with each heart's loss
A star in Freedom's flag, because a cross
In all its cosmic glory, shining still,
Once graced the darkened summit of a hill.

SARAH MIZELLE MORGAN

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, 15, Illinois

LAKE GENEVA CONFERENCE

The general program for the Religious Education and Unitarian Youth divisions at Lake Geneva for this year will be found in the column, "The Field," on page 66 of this issue of UNITY. There are, however, several other interesting features and bits of information which we want to include on this page.

The Alliance Seminar will not conflict with any of the R. E. courses or the general lectures. It will consist of several talks and discussions conducted by different leaders. The Seminar will be coordinated under the supervision and direction of Miss Sara Comins, President of the General Alliance.

The Ministers' Institute will meet at the same hour as the Alliance Seminar and thus avoid all other conflicts. This is one of a series of eight regional Ministers' Institutes being held throughout the Summer and Fall. These institutes will all deal with the pressing and vital question facing Unitarians today—"The Basis of Unitarian Advance." It was announced in the earlier publicity that this Institute would be under the direction of Rev. A. Powell Davies, Chairman of Committee A, of the American Unitarian Association. Owing to an automobile accident in which Mr. Davies was severely injured, he will be unable to attend. However, Dr. Thaddeus Clark, Minister of our church in New Orleans and a member of Committee A, will lead the discussions.

Architects of Peace will be the general theme of the morning public lecture series and will be given by Dr. Sunder Joshi. Dr. Joshi is a special lecturer for the University of Chicago and a member of the faculty of the University of Indiana. He is a dynamic and stimulating speaker. These lectures and discussions on post-war planning should be of interest to everybody.

Cost: Registration Fee, $4.00; Board and Room: adults $16.00 (average); young people $14.00 (average); children under 12 years of age, three-fourths of adult charge; children under 6 years of age, one-half of adult charge. Registration must be paid on all persons three years and over.

Nursery Care and Supervised Play will be provided for children between the ages of 3 and 12, inclusive. This will be in charge of four competently trained and qualified persons.

General Recreational Activities for the entire camp will be under the direction of Mr. Robert Ruesch of Detroit.

Note Bene: Special sessions for laymen will be held under the direction of Mr. Fred McGill, Executive Director of the Laymen's League. It is also expected that Mr. William Roger Greeley, President of the Laymen's League and a member of the Board of Directors of the A.U.A., will be present.

Scholarships and Financial Aid are available to a limited extent. Several Alliance scholarships have already been awarded, as have some for the Youth section. Many churches and church organizations have provided funds to assist their own members in attending. If anyone desires further information about the availability of scholarships, please write to the Western Conference office. There will be some financial aid for ministers who desire it, as a result of contributions for the Ministers' Institute on the part of the Department of the Ministry and the Ministerial Union.

Come to Geneva, August 13 to 20, it will be an enjoyable and constructive "change" for the whole family.

Activities of the Secretary: May-June.

Visits: Beverly, Evanston, Detroit (Western Conference), Boston (May Meetings), Hinsdale, Fort Wayne, and Hanska, Minnesota.

As Dean of the Lake Geneva Conference, the Secretary will be kept busy through most of the Summer.

The Secretary continues as a member of the Executive Committee of the Unitarian Ministerial Union and as Editor of the *UMU News-Letter*. He was also elected to the Nominating Committee of the Union and appointed Chairman of the Program Committee for the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.

NEWS NOTES

Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Rev. Wallace W. Robbins, and Rev. Randall S. Hilton have been appointed Editorial Advisors for the *Journal of Liberal Religion*.

Rev. Donald Harrington, Minister of People's Liberal Church of Chicago and The Beverly Unitarian Fellowship, Chicago, has resigned from his churches to accept the call to be Associate Minister with Dr. John Haynes Holmes, at Community Church, New York City. He will begin his new duties September 1.

Rev. Raymond B. Bragg, Minister at Minneapolis, will again serve as Executive Director of the Unitarian Service Committee during the summer months.

Rev. Lon Ray Call, former secretary of the Western Conference and now Minister-at-Large for the American Unitarian Association, who has been serving as interim minister in Des Moines, will have charge of the Summer activities of the church in Colorado Springs.

Rev. John G. Gill was installed as the minister at Alton, Illinois, on Sunday, June 4. Rev. Laurence R. Plank and Rev. Randall S. Hilton gave the charges to the congregation and to the minister. Mr. Eben Rodgers, President of the Church, conducted the act of installation.

It was good news to read in the *Alliance World* that the Midwest Region led all the rest in total increase in Alliance memberships this past year. The Midwest Region gained 130 members. The nearest competitor was the West Coast with 115.

The Meadville Theological School will celebrate its Centennial the week of October 22.

Watch for the announcement about
THE UNITARIAN CHURCH OF THE LARGER FELLOWSHIP